

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTONIO WHEELER and HEM
RAMACHANDRAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PETER BANYAI, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00154-APG-NJK

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

12 Plaintiff Hem Ramachandran has failed to update his address. *E.g.*, Docket Nos. 10, 12,
13 13, 16. “A party, not the district court, bears the burden of keeping the court apprised of any
14 changes in his mailing address.” *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (*per curiam*);
15 *see also In re Hammer*, 940 F.2d 524, 526 (9th Cir. 1991). To that end, the local rules require that
16 litigants immediately file written notification of any change of address, and the local rules
17 expressly warn that failure to do so may result in case-dispositive sanctions. *See* Local Rule IA 3-
18 1.

19 On March 1, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff Ramachandran to file a notice of change of
20 address by March 29, 2024. Docket No. 11. Plaintiff Ramachandran failed to do so. The Court
21 expressly warned that “**FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN**
22 **DISMISSAL OF THIS CASE.**” *Id.* at 1 (emphasis in original). To date, Plaintiff Ramachandran
23 has failed to comply with that order.

24 Plaintiff Ramachandran has disobeyed the local rules and the Court’s orders requiring
25 prompt updating of a litigant’s address. Plaintiff Ramachandran’s failure to update his address,
26 his disobedience with the local rules, and his disobedience of the Court’s orders are abusive
27 litigation practices that have interfered with the Court’s ability to hear this case, delayed litigation,
28 disrupted the Court’s timely management of its docket, wasted judicial resources, and threatened

1 the integrity of the Court's orders and the orderly administration of justice. Sanctions less drastic
2 than dismissal are unavailable because Plaintiff Ramachandran has refused to comply with the
3 orders of this Court notwithstanding the warning that case-dispositive sanctions may be imposed.

4 Accordingly, in light of the circumstances outlined above, the undersigned
5 **RECOMMENDS** that this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice as to Plaintiff Ramachandran.

6 Dated: August 22, 2024

7
8 
9 Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

10 **NOTICE**

11 This report and recommendation is submitted to the United States District Judge assigned
12 to this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party who objects to this report and
13 recommendation must file a written objection supported by points and authorities within fourteen
14 days of being served with this report and recommendation. Local Rule IB 3-2(a). Failure to file
15 a timely objection may waive the right to appeal the district court's order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951
16 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).